



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

The consumption of none of these articles was in any way affected by the famine of 1891-92.¹

This fact proves that the millions of the Russian peasantry still count for very little as consumers in Russian international trade. The transformation of the peasant into a wage laborer, very far from being fatal to Russian capitalism, as the "peasantist" economist maintains, will virtually create a large body of consumers and prove a new inducement for the development of Russian industry.

ISAAC A. HOURWICH.

COMPARISON OF THE VOTES ON THE MCKINLEY AND WILSON BILLS.

AN analysis of the vote on the Wilson bill shows little of interest from a partisan standpoint save that party lines were effectively drawn. The Republicans voted solidly against it and the Democrats almost as solidly for it. The few Democrats who voted nay were influenced by the income tax feature rather than by the tariff provisions. New York furnished eight and Louisiana four of the eighteen Democratic votes against the bill. Pennsylvania, Louisiana and California each furnished one Democrat to oppose the measure on grounds other than the income tax.

The sectional analysis of the vote is perhaps more interesting than the division on party lines. The South was practically solid for the bill, only eight votes being cast against and one hundred for it. Of the eight negative votes, four came from Louisiana, one each from North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee and Kentucky. This is seven votes less than the South gave for the McKinley Bill, while the vote in the South against the McKinley bill was only half as large as that cast for the present measure. But the number of members voting now is more than one hundred in excess of those recorded on the bill of 1890.

Without the South the majority against the bill would be twenty-seven; on the same basis, the majority for protection three years ago

¹ The imports of these articles through the European frontier in 1892 compared as follows with the imports in 1891 (in thousands of rubles) :

Articles.	1891	1892	Increase or decrease.
Coffee - - - -	5,230	5,859	+ 629
Cocoa - - - -	445	579	+ 134
Tea - - - -	15,364	16,554	+1,190
Tobacco and cigars -	2,464	2,111	- 353
Beverages - - -	9,293	8,158	- 1,135
Herrings - - - -	6,439	9,048	+2,609

was one hundred and four. Aside from New England, New York and Pennsylvania and the far Western states no section shows a majority against the bill. New England opposed it by a vote of nineteen to six, an apparent loss of three votes from the protective side as compared with the vote of 1890. Two of the three however were voting against the income tax rather than against protection. From New York a majority of thirteen opposed the bill, but as eight of the negative votes had just been recorded against the income tax amendment, New York would probably have supported the bill on the tariff question alone. Pennsylvania voted more than two to one against the bill, but New Jersey gave a majority in its favor.

Of the Middle States, Ohio and Illinois were equally divided, both showing a great loss to protection since the McKinley bill was voted upon. The free wool clause does not appear to have frightened the representatives from the great wool growing states. Ohio, Michigan, Texas, California and Montana, the leading wool producing states, gave thirty votes against protection to twenty-two for it. In 1890 they voted twenty-six to twelve for the McKinley bill. Without Texas the present vote stands twenty-two votes against the bill to eighteen in its favor. The same states supported protection in 1890 by a vote of twenty-six to four.

If all the states from New York and Maryland to the Mississippi river be taken, the vote stands seventy-six in favor to seventy-eight against the bill. If New England be added so as to take in practically all the manufacturing states, the vote stands eighty to ninety-seven against the bill. If the ten voters who opposed the measure because of the income tax clause be shifted to the other side, the manufacturing states give a majority of five against protection.

The agricultural section from Minnesota and the Dakotas to Missouri and Kansas gave a majority of two in favor of the bill. They were twenty-seven to four in favor of the McKinley bill. The Western states voted six to ten against the Wilson bill, they were solid for protection three years ago.

Summarizing, we find eleven states, casting sixty-eight votes, solid for the Wilson bill. All of these except Colorado are in the South, while eight states, casting sixteen votes, are solid against it. Three of the latter are in New England, the others are new states of the Northwest. Leaving out the votes of the states that were solid, the bill would have passed by a majority of twelve. No sort of combination,

comparison or analysis of this vote can be made to yield encouragement to the protectionists.¹

W. H.

TRADE UNIONISM AND THE EVOLUTION OF THE TYPE-SETTING MACHINE.

IN order to an understanding of the movement which is now on foot among the trade-union compositors in England in regard to the use of type-setting machines—a movement which in the last few months has caused almost as much stir in the composing rooms of the newspaper offices as the introduction of steam presses did among the hand-press men of two generations ago—it is necessary to have some idea of the evolution of the type-setting machine and the perfection which it has now reached. A good opportunity for tracing this evolution was afforded

¹ The votes, by states, on the respective bills were as follows :

STATES	McKINLEY BILL		WILSON BILL		STATES	McKINLEY BILL		WILSON BILL	
	YEA	NAY	YEA	NAY		YEA	NAY	YEA	NAY
Maine -----	4	--	--	3	Alabama ----	1	5	9	--
New Hamp.---	2	--	--	2	Arkansas ----	--	2	6	--
Vermont ----	2	--	--	2	Delaware ----	--	1	2	--
Massachusetts	10	2	3	9	Florida ----	--	1	1	--
Rhode Island	2	--	1	1	Georgia ----	--	6	11	--
Connecticut--	3	1	2	2	Kentucky ----	--	6	10	1
Total ----	23	3	6	19	Louisiana ---	--	3	2	4
New York ----	16	10	9	22	Maryland ----	3	2	5	--
New Jersey --	4	2	5	3	Mississippi --	--	6	7	--
Pennsylvania	19	4	8	19	N. Carolina --	2	1	8	1
Total ----	39	16	22	44	S. Carolina --	1	2	6	1
Ohio -----	14	4	10	10	Tennessee ---	2	5	8	1
Indiana -----	2	3	11	2	Texas -----	--	8	12	--
Illinois -----	11	1	11	11	Virginia ----	4	--	9	--
Michigan -----	9	--	5	7	West Virginia	2	--	4	--
Wisconsin ---	6	2	6	4	Total ----	15	48	100	8
Total ----	42	10	43	34	California ---	2	--	3	4
Iowa -----	10	1	2	10	Colorado ---	1	--	2	--
Kansas -----	5	1	5	3	Idaho -----	--	--	--	--
Nebraska ---	2	--	3	3	Montana ----	1	--	--	1
Missouri ----	2	2	14	2	Oregon -----	1	--	--	2
Minnesota ---	5	--	3	4	Nevada -----	--	--	--	1
N. Dakota ---	1	--	--	1	Washington --	1	--	--	2
S. Dakota ---	2	--	--	2	Wyoming ----	--	--	1	--
Total ----	27	4	27	25	Total ----	6	--	6	10

Total for McKinley Bill, 152; against, 81.

Total for Wilson Bill, 204; against, 140.